



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/616,635	07/26/2000	Kevin R. Boyle	PHB 34,367	9407
65913	7590	02/07/2008	EXAMINER	
NXP, B.V.			RAMPURIA, SHARAD K	
NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
M/S41-SJ			2617	
1109 MCKAY DRIVE				
SAN JOSE, CA 95131				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/07/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/616,635

Applicant(s)

BOYLE, KEVIN R.

Examiner

Sharad Rampuria

Art Unit

2617

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 04 January 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-3,5-12 and 14-18.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
Please see appended folio.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.

13. Other: _____.


 GEORGE ENG
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Response to Remarks

Applicant's arguments filed on 01/04/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Relating to Claims 1-3, 5-9, 14-18:

In view of the fact, that **HOULIHAN** teaches, "As disclosed by Board's decision on 03/28/2005 in Pg.6; it is well explained in (column 1, line 67, to column 2, line 5; column 5, lines 28-32) that either the microphone (voice input port) or the speaker (voice output port) may be placed on the tether member 136. ...we conclude that claims 1 and 10 are anticipated by Houlihan. As for claims 5 and 14, as illustrated in Figure 1 of Houlihan, the voice port mounted on the end of the tether member 136 is located at an end of the tether member furthest from the casing (structure 130), and furthermore, **HOULIHAN** teaches "Tether member 136 preferably includes an antenna wire for the radiotelephone circuitry of apparatus 100 so that when voice port 134 is pulled out to deploy that port from the remainder of the apparatus, the antenna wire is elongated and becomes more effective as an antenna. Tether 136 may also include wires for conveying electrical signals to a speaker transducer in voice port 134. Alternatively, the speaker transducer may be in the apparatus which remains on the user's wrist, and tether member 136 may include an acoustic coupler (such as a hollow plastic tube) from the transducer to voice port 134," (**HOULIHAN**; Col.3; 41-51), which **corresponds** to the claimed limitation as "wherein said microphone is located at an end of said physically-shortened electric antenna furthest from said casing." Thus, it is evidently, the explanations above is directed to the antenna wire is more effective as an antenna that means the antenna is physically short

but its electromagnetic field or power or strength is more than its actual length, is exactly as applicant is rely upon, (Applicant's Specification (filed on 01/21/2003), Page. 6; 9-14), that positively, anticipated by **HOULIHAN**. Hence, it is believed that **HOULIHAN** still teaches the claimed limitations.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to **combine** the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Also, in response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper **hindsight** reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

In this case, **HOULIHAN** teaches a technique for wristwatch radiotelephone is usable as a radiotelephone without the need to remove the apparatus from the user's wrist and without the need to plug any additional elements into the apparatus. (Please see, col.1; 46-51) by assigning

Art Unit: 2617

the microphone on the antenna, **HOULIHAN** reduces the extra equipment to connect with the device, which is in the same field of endeavor as **NISHIKIDO**. Therefore, one skill in the art would recognize the amalgamation of the above two references is proper.

Relating to Claims 10-11:

Applicant argues the limitations which were not disclosed in the claims 10-11, filed on (09/04/2007; that is prior to the amended claims).

Because the remaining claims depend directly/indirectly, from one of the independent claims discussed above, as a result the response is the same justification as set forth above.

With the intention of that explanation, it is believed and as enlighten above, the refutation are sustained.

/Sharad Rampuria/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2617